
Subject: Re: [railML 3] Areas in railML 3

Posted by [Jörg von Lingen](#) on Sun, 17 Oct 2021 04:07:23 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,

it looks a good idea to bring area objects on the topology level defined by netElements and combing them with general attributes. However, our railML model is built up that IL elements link to IS elements which are linking to netElements in topology but not vice versa. If we now have only the netElements for defining the constrains of an area, we would need a clever way to search for the functional elements contained within. Especially for (conventional) interlocking purpose the location of elements in terms of km x.y or even coordinates are less important.

Interlocking areas: It is not that easy to bring them all together as they have different functions behind and therefore different needs to be considered. Quite often there is the issue of defining the protection from the inside and the outside. Sometimes we need to define the status of elements within, e.g. released for local operation or not. These are all functional needs, which cannot be defined in the infrastructure itself.

ETCS is a kind of Janus head. It uses interlocking functions without really considering the normal interlocking elements. Thus it is more focused on some infrastructure features like exact location.

We may have a similar way of defining the basics of an area but I don't think we can press them in one <genericArea> element.

Best regards,
Joerg v. Lingen - Interlocking Coordinator
